



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Shakespeare, and the influence upon him of the Elizabethan poet.

9. Bleier, K. *Die Technik Robert Brownings in seinen Dramatischen Monologen*. Diss. Marburg, 1910. This is a study of B.'s method in writing his most famous short poems.

10. Schmidt, Karl. *Robert Browning als Dichter und Mensch. Eine Studie*. Program. Tauberbischofsheim, 1910. This is an examination of B.'s personality and opinions as revealed in his poetry. He begins with *One Word More*, and studies many of the shorter and some of the longer poems in detail. Again he shows his enthusiasm for *Fifine at the Fair*. Schmidt is thoroughly acquainted with the complete works of B., his delight in the poems is founded on solid and accurate knowledge, and his influence in increasing the number of B.'s readers in Germany is bound to be felt.

11. Koepfel, Emil. *Robert Browning (Lit. Forsch., 48)*. 1911. Cover title says 1912.

12. Meyer-Franck, Helene. *Robert Browning. The Ring and the Book. Eine Interpretation*. Göttingen, 1912.

I shall be grateful for correction of errors in the above lists, or for any additional information or suggestions.

WM. LYON PHELPS.

Yale University.

# KARL LEBRECHT IMMERMANN

*Immermanns Werke*. Herausgegeben von HARRY MAYNC. Kritisch durchgesehene und erläuterte Ausgabe. Fünf Bände. Leipzig und Wien: Bibliographisches Institut, 1906.

*Immermanns Werke*. Herausgegeben und mit einem Lebensbild versehen von WERNER DEETJEN. Vier Bände. Berlin-Leipzig-Wien-Stuttgart: Bong & Co., 1911.

*Immermanns Weltanschauung*. Von SIGMUND VON LEMPICKI. Berlin-Zehlendorf: B. Behrs Verlag, 1910. 136 pp.

*Immermanns Tristan und Isolde*. Von MAX SZYMANZIG. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1911. 258 pp.

*The Personal and Literary Relations of Heinrich Heine to Karl Immermann*. By GRACE MABEL BACON. (Sine bibliopola et loco), 1910. 98 pp.

Immermann and Platen were born in the same year (1796), Heine one year later. Their triangular feud has been frequently described and variously interpreted. The relative worth of these three techy comrades in life and letters can be most cogently gotten at by comparison, for where any one of them is strong the other two are weak. Heine, richly endowed with lyric spontaneity, is arbitrary in form, flippant in content and of mediocre versatility. Platen, gifted with a lyric talent not so spontaneous, is extremely artistic in form, sincere in content and of more than average intellectuality. Immermann, painfully lacking in lyric genius, is ambitious but weak and labored in form, uncommonly rich and sterling in content and of an extraordinary versatility. Consequently that has happened which was to be expected: Heine is still very much alive among general readers, Platen's clientele is confined to the artistically sensitive, while Immermann, like Cervantes, Goldsmith, Fouqué, Prévost and many others, is now a poet read in only one work, *Oberhof*. From the standpoint of the poet, in the strict sense of the word, Immermann is as far behind his wrangling rivals as he is, on the ground of intellectual and historical deserts, ahead of them.

Immermann was, so far as is known, the first German to dramatize the Charlemagne-Roland-Ganelon matter.<sup>1</sup> He was the second and most important German to dramatize the Petrarch-Laura-Sade matter.<sup>2</sup> He dramatized the downfall of King Periander, a theme which Gerhart Hauptmann is longing to treat.<sup>3</sup> He

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Werner Deetjen, *Immermanns Jugenddramen*, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, January, 1912, "A Note on Immermann's *Petrarca*," p. 31, by the writer.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Gerhart Hauptmann, *Griechischer Frühling*, pp. 208-223. Hauptmann says (p. 209): "Schon vor achtundzwanzig Jahren, während einer kurzen akademischen Studienzeit, drängten sich mir die rätselvollen Gestalten des Periander, seiner Gattin Melissa und des Lykophron, seines Sohnes, auf. Ich

must have been the first German to translate (1824) Scott's *Ivanhoe*, though he was assisted in this by Elisa Ahlefeldt-Lütow. Following in the wake of Andreas Gryphius (1657) and Arnim (1811) he wrote *Cardenio und Celinde*, which inspired Franz Dülberg to do the same.<sup>4</sup> In 1826 he finished *Das Trauerspiel in Tirol* and changed the drama in 1833 into *Andreas Hofer*. Again his theme was excellent and his result praiseworthy.<sup>5</sup> *Merlin* appeared in 1832 and called forth lavish adulation from Tieck.<sup>6</sup>

darf wohl sagen, dass die Tragödie dieser drei Menschen in ihrer unsäglich bittersüssen Schwermut all die Jahre meine Seele beschäftigt hat." In the following pages Hauptmann discusses the dramatic possibilities of this theme. The contention is not made that he was drawn to it solely by Immermann's drama. Was he attracted, on the other hand, solely by Herodotus's account? It seems at least that Immermann made a good choice of subject.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. *Cardenio*, Drama in fünf Akten, von Franz Dülberg. Berlin: Egon Fleischel & Co., 1912. In his introduction, Dülberg tells how Immermann's *Cardenio und Celinde* came into his possession in 1908, and how it occurred to him that this was the same theme that Gryphius had used, who based his work on a Spanish novelette, *La fuerza del desengaño*, and that Arnim had also treated it in his *Halle und Jerusalem*. He continues: "Das Merkwürdige geschah, dass Immermanns Gestalten sich mit meinen eigenen Seelenerlebnissen verbanden und so verwandelt mich vier Jahre hindurch nicht aus ihrer Gewalt liessen." Dülberg says that the essential difference between his treatment and that of Immermann lies in his own use of the magic of blood as over against Immermann's use of the magic of witches and ghosts.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Anton Dörner, *Andreas Hofer auf der Bühne*. Brixen: Buchhandlung der Verlagsanstalt Tyrolia, 1912. 89 pp. Dörner writes (p. 13): "Es bleibt Tatsache, dass gegen hundert Anno neun-Dramen geschrieben wurden, und zwar 61 Hofer-Stücke, 5 Schauspiele über P. Mayr, je 4 über Speckbacher und Siegmayer, 2 über Straub, und 12 Musikstücke." Following the lead of Rosegger, Keller, Auerbach and Hebbel, Dörner concludes that Hofer's life and death do not lend themselves well to dramatic treatment in classic style: Hofer's story is "rührend" but not "erhebend." Dörner is in favor of a Tyrolese Volksbühne for Hofer. He devotes much space to Immermann's *Hofer*, but finds High German ill adapted to the case.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Deetjen, *Immermanns Werke*, Vol. 1, p. lii. Immerman gave Tieck a copy of *Merlin*. Tieck said: "Wie müssen Ihnen, die Sie so Grosses jetzt leisten, meine leichten, kleinen Sachen vorkommen." Tieck

Wagner was influenced by it in *Der Ring* and *Parsifal*.<sup>7</sup> And if it did not influence Hauptmann's *Versunkene Glocke*<sup>8</sup> then parallel ideas are misleading. Furthermore, in his latest work, *Die indische Lilie*, Sudermann pays his respects to Immermann, commenting upon the fact that *Münchhausen* was the first novel he ever read, describing the "Oberhof" and Charlemagne's sword, and, what is of supreme importance, taking the main motive of "Thea" bodily from "Münchhausen." His tragedy of romantic love, *Ghismonda*,<sup>9</sup> was finished in 1837, based on the best known and best story from the "Decamerone." In 1835 *Die Epigonen* appeared and in 1838 *Münchhausen*, in the praise of which so eminent an authority as Heinrich von Treitschke<sup>10</sup> speaks loud and long. Richard M. Meyer<sup>11</sup> looks upon his *Memorabilien* as one of the most important psychological documents we have on Germany at the beginning of the nineteenth century. And no word

was then writing such unread and not very readable novelettes as *Der Jahrmarkt*, *Der Mondsüchtige*, *Der Heuen-Sabbath*, *Die Ahnenprobe*.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Paul Kunad, *Immermanns Merlin und seine Beziehungen zu Richard Wagners Ring des Nibelungen*, Leipzig, 1906. 16 pp. Kunad draws a striking parallel between Wotan and Klingsor, Siegfried and Merlin. His praise of Immermann is extravagant.

<sup>8</sup>The general plan and underlying idea of the two dramas are very similar. Heinrich and Merlin resemble each other in deed and desire. The most striking parallel is to be found, however, between Niniana and Rautendelein. There is every reason to believe that Hauptmann knew *Merlin*.

<sup>9</sup>Though Immermann undoubtedly knew James Thomson's *Tancred and Sigismunda* (1745 ca.), no one need lose any time trying to point out the influence of Thomson on Immermann. The former, basing his work on *Gil Blas*, taking only the names from the *Decamerone*, wrote a political drama. The latter, dramatizing the first story of the fourth day of Boccaccio, wrote a love drama. Immermann could, of course, have known Thomson through Lessing.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Heinrich von Treitschke, *Deut. Geschichte im 19. Jahrh.*, Bd. 4, Seiten 446-451. On page 450, Treitschke says: "Ihm bleibt der Ruhm, dass er in seinen beiden Romanen seinem Zeitalter den Spiegel vorhielt, wie vordem Goethe im Wilhelm Meister und nachher Freytag in Soll und Haben. Nur wer diese Zeitromane kennt, versteht den inneren Zusammenhang der drei Epochen unserer neuesten Geschichte."

<sup>11</sup>Cf. R. M. Meyer, *Die deut. Lit. d. 19. Jahrh.*, p. 116.

of praise is needed for the eleven finished cantos of *Tristan und Isolde*. They speak for themselves. There is real poetry in all of these works, in addition to which Immermann wrote a long series of other works, which, except for scholars, have gone the way of all flesh when the spirit that guides it is well intentioned but weak, including his many poems. It is the breadth of his interests and the consequent irregularity of his output that account for the almost total neglect of him between 1840, the year of his death, and 1896, the centenary of his birth. His resuscitation<sup>12</sup> since 1896 is to be accounted for on various grounds, not all of which are wholly commendable.

Immermann's enormous "Belesenheit" and consequent popularity with scholars rather than general readers undoubtedly accounts for the fact that he has been as well edited as any German writer of third rank, better than some, and as well as some of second rank. Maync justifies his eclectic edition on the ground that Boxberger commits "fast auf jeder Seite grobe Versehen und philologisch unerlaubte Eigenmächtigkeiten, und Koch druckt unter anderem den 'Münchhausen' nach der posthumen zweiten Auflage ab, die Dutzende von Sätzen und Satzteilen hat unter den Tisch fallen lassen." Why Maync, in the discussion of his predecessors, overlooks Muncker's edition is inexplicable. With Maync's choosing,<sup>13</sup> his 107

pages of general and special introductory matter, his numerous scattered notes, his 229 pages of special notes, paralipomena and variant readings, his facsimile reproduction of Immermann's letter to Goethe, his use of C. F. Lessing's portrait of Immermann as a frontispiece, and the external workmanship that characterizes the Bibliographisches Institut, with all these things the specialist must be satisfied<sup>14</sup> and the general reader pleased. The specialist must be satisfied, for a pure text based on the original, and clearly printed, is all that can be asked. And if Koch did drop a good deal of the original, that is certainly unpardonable. As to the texts of Koch and Maync as they stand, however, there are 36 differences between Koch and the original in the first chapter of not quite 7 pages, and Maync adopted 33 of Koch's readings as over against the original.<sup>15</sup> All of these variations concern orthography and punctuation. And the general reader must be pleased, for it is impossible to form a just opinion of Immermann without reading a few of his nearly 400 poems. Maync has published the 26 that are most important biographically and which, at the same time, have the greatest literary excellence, as well as his 37 *Xenien*, the most significant bit of lyric writing Immermann ever did. In short, it is from this edition that one can get the best idea of the best of Immermann.

From the standpoint of notes, variants and so on, Deetjen's edition naturally offers little new material over that of Maync unless it be

<sup>12</sup> Thus, in addition to the five long biographical introductions by Boxberger, Koch, Muncker, Maync and Deetjen, and Putlitz's biography of 697 pages, Harry Maync is soon to publish a new Immermann biography, and he is also working on a critical edition of *Münchhausen*. Uhland, Eichendorff and Tieck have hardly fared so well. It looks like a case of group psychology in letters.

<sup>13</sup> Koch (1888), Muncker (1893), Maync (1906) and Deetjen (1911) all contain *Münchhausen*, *Hofer*, *Mertin* and selections from *Memorabilien*. Maync and Deetjen alone contain *Epigonen*. Muncker, Maync and Deetjen contain *Tulifüntchen*. Koch alone contains *Goethe und die falschen Wanderjahre*, Muncker alone contains *Alexis*, *Ghismonda*, *Tristan* and *Friedrich II*, Maync alone contains 5 poems, 21 sonnets and the *Xenien* that first appeared in Heine's *Reisebilder*, while Deetjen is unique in publishing *Der Schwanenritter* for the first time in a regular edition of Immermann's works.

<sup>14</sup> One note will suffice to show the thoroughness with which Maync has edited Immermann. *Tulifüntchen* begins with a dedication to Michael Beer and the first canto is entitled "Tulifüntchen Fliegentöter." Maync (Bd. V. S. 441) says: "Fliegentöter, wie Homer von Hermes dem Argostöter, Fouqué von Sigurd dem Schlangentöter, Cooper in seinen Lederstrumpferzählungen vom Wildtöter, Adolph Stoeber von Gustav Adolf dem Schlangentöter, Immermann im 'Tal' vom Drachentöter, Heine in 'Atta Troll' vom Bärenstöter spricht," and so on.

<sup>15</sup> It would be a tedious task to compare the two texts throughout. *Münchhausen* was originally published at Düsseldorf, Verlag von J. G. Schaub. Vol. I appeared in 1838, Vols. II, III, IV in 1839. There are 1350 pages. The first edition is a splendid bit of printing.

the unwarranted spelling of Immermann's name. Theodor Hildebrandt's Napoleon-like portrait of Immermann is used as a frontispiece to Vol. I, a portrait of Gräfin Ahlefeldt precedes Vol. II, a facsimile reproduction of a letter by Immermann to Hildebrandt introduces Vol. III. The mechanical workmanship of the set is superb—as we might expect from the imprint of Bong & Co. The main interest of this edition lies in the inclusion of the 363 verses of the *Schwanenritter*<sup>16</sup> fragment. It is again typical of Immermann that he should have been interested in such a complicated saga. He claims to have gotten the first idea from the second part of Novalis's *Ofterdingen* (Astralis). It is written in a stanza of eleven verses, and was to consist of five cantos. To conclude from the finished part, Immermann had in mind a light, humorous epic, somewhat after the fashion of *Tulifantchen*.<sup>17</sup> The scene is laid near Düsseldorf and, to judge from the sprightly grace of the finished verses, it would have been one of Immermann's best productions. Felix Mendelssohn was charmed by it as he was also by the poem, *Spruch des Dichters*.<sup>18</sup> The epic contains some reminiscences of Countess Ahlefeldt.

Starting from Immermann's own statement,<sup>19</sup> that he had "eine eigene, freie, seltsame Weltanschauung," and adopting Gomperz's definition of "Weltanschauung,"<sup>20</sup> Lempicki proceeds to analyze the character of Immermann the thinker to the absolute exclusion of Immermann the poet; he will study and weigh the esoteric side of his hero. That is an interesting problem—as are also the results.

Immermann lived through three transitional epochs: the eve of Rationalism, the full day of Romanticism, the dawn of Realism. As a

youth he loved Luise von Strasser, who married another; as a man he loved Countess Lützow, who was already married to Count Lützow; his legal business and his literary diversion were naturally more or less at loggerheads; his contemporaries refused him the recognition that was due him, to say nothing of what he thought was due him; and he suffered from a nervous disorder. All these things combined made Immermann a pessimist, says Lempicki, who then discusses Immermann's pessimism from the quadruple standpoint of poetry, which was to be excluded, religion, politics and society, concluding that the main characteristics of his subject's "Weltanschauung" are independence, self-reliance, and a striving after the real, the positive, the true. This is correct. Lempicki has produced an instructive study for those who have not read Immermann, while it gives those who have read him nothing new, for Immermann expressed himself on himself fully and frequently. Indeed the book would add but little to our knowledge of Immermann the author only of the five chiliastic sonnets,<sup>21</sup> *Merlin*<sup>22</sup> and *Memorabilien*.<sup>23</sup> There are ten typographical errors,<sup>24</sup> and one misstatement.<sup>25</sup>

There are seven fast reasons why Szymanzig's treatise on Immermann's *Tristan und Isolde* should be not simply excellent, but definitive. (1) Immermann tells us precisely how he came to write *Tristan*. (2) He tells us precisely what sort of *Tristan* he was going to write. (3) He tells us precisely what sources he used. (4) The general *Tristansage* had already been thoroughly treated. (5) Immermann's *Tristan* is a fragment, while Szymanzig's monograph is a complete book. (6) Szymanzig's territory to be covered was as clearly defined as it was attractive. (7) Szymanzig adopted Elster's method. And his book is, in fact, the last

<sup>16</sup> Cf. J. F. D. Blöte, "Der historische Schwanritter," *Zeitschr. für rom. Phil.*, Bd. xxi, pp. 176-191, and *ibid.* Bd. xxv, pp. 1-44. These are articles of abysmal erudition.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Joseph Klövekorn, *Immermanns Verhältnis zum deutschen Altertum*, pp. 10-13.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Putlitz, Bd. I, p. 311.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Gustav Putlitz, *Karl Immermann. Sein Leben und seine Werke*, Berlin, 1870, p. 88.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. H. Gomperz, *Weltanschauungslehre*, I. Teil, Leipzig, 1905, p. 4.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Hempel, XI Teil, pp. 222-226.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, xv Teil, pp. 35-160.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, xviii-xx Teil, 704 pp.

<sup>24</sup> On pp. 10, 25, 52, 78, 96, 98, 101, 120, 132, 134.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. p. 62. Friedrich Schlegel certainly did not go over to the Catholic Church as late as 1813. Elster (*Heines sämtliche Werke*, Bd. v, p. 239) says 1803, while Biese (*Lit. Ges.*, Bd. II, p. 352) and Kummer (*Litges. des 19. Jahrh.*, p. 80) both say 1808. This is undoubtedly correct.

word on the subject. There are still a number of things about Immermann that need clearing up; but not his *Tristan und Isolde*.

After a brief review of the *Tristansage* from Béról to Hans Sachs, Szymanzig gives a characterization of Immermann, his conception of poetry in general, his attitude toward Middle High German and the inner and outer circumstances that led him to write *Tristan*. Immermann's epic is then compared with that of Gottfried from the standpoint of action, content, character-drawing, descriptive ability, reflection and lyricism. The construction of the poem, and its style, including phonology, morphology, vocabulary, syntax and prosody, are treated at great length and with unreserved condemnation. Szymanzig thinks that Immermann would have done vastly better had he, like Bédier, told the whole story in prose. In view of the exceedingly small praise that the critic has for the poet, one wonders that he had the courage and persistence to write a very long treatise on a very inferior work. Such expressions as "Immermann hat Gottfried verballhornt," "Immermann konnte Idealgestalten nun einmal nicht zeichnen," "gekünstelt und gequält," "völliger Mangel an lyrischer Kunst," "kein Gefühl für die Schönheit der Form," "krasse Geschmacklosigkeit," "echt romantischer Blödsinn," and so on, take up much space. There is, albeit, some praise for Immermann, as well as a complete register of names and things, a detailed table of contents, and a bibliography of sixty-four familiar titles. It is difficult, however, to see how some of these had anything to do with Szymanzig's study, while the one<sup>26</sup> that bears such a striking similarity is not mentioned.

Szymanzig is misleading in the following points: Immermann did not base his *Tal von Ronceval* wholly on Fr. Schlegel and Fouqué. He took the essentials from Des Stricker's *Karl* (p. 28).<sup>27</sup> It is absolutely impossible to say when Immermann first became interested

in the Tristan matter, and it is especially unsafe to decide such dates by references to the theme in earlier works (pp. 32-38).<sup>28</sup> It is unjust to Immermann to judge him as a poet by this work, which was written hurriedly and never revised. It is unreasonable to complain because the poet did not follow his original outline.<sup>29</sup> It is safe to assume that Immermann's knowledge of the *Eddas* was more than superficial.<sup>30</sup> Immermann can unquestionably be excused for not telling everything, sometimes not even motivating parts of the general *Tristansage*,<sup>31</sup> since he felt that he was dealing with a familiar theme. It does not further but retards the appreciation of Immermann's poem to explain, from the standpoint of the psychological philosopher,<sup>32</sup> the ways and means of drawing an emotional character. It is sometimes difficult to see how Szymanzig would justify his German. Thus, he writes: "Gewiss sie hat gefehlt und geirrt, doch sie war sich dessen nicht bewusst" (p. 93). And there are twenty-four faith-shaking typographical errors.<sup>33</sup> However, these are not epoch-making matters. Szymanzig has written the best monograph that has thus far been produced on Immermann's "literarische Kuriosität, ein Werk, in dem der Mangel an Können sich aufs Peinlichste bemerkbar macht" (p. 238). His com-

<sup>26</sup> Immermann had a habit of referring to works and authors in his works which is as misleading as it is unpoetic. Thus, in his description of the Abbot (Hempel, XIII, p. 168), he refers to Origines, Chrysostomus, Augustin, Arnobius, Lactantius and Eusebius. But no one should conclude from this that Immermann was for the first time studying these writers.

<sup>27</sup> In the *Anhang*, Szymanzig publishes *Das Manuskript der vollständigen Motive*.

<sup>28</sup> Immermann owned *Die Edda*, No. 794 in his library.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Wolfgang Golther: *Tristan und Isolde*, Leipzig, 1907. Golther constructs the *Ur-Tristan* (pp. 40-58). One needs only to read it to see that there are a number of motives which Immermann could not well introduce.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. pp. 112-136. Lessing, Kant and Wundt are made come to the rescue.

<sup>31</sup> On pp. 38, 56, 62, 68, 69, 77 (2), 79, 98, 100, 110, 135, 138, 158, 164, 185, 187, 201 (2), 203, 213, 220, 221, 238.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Johann Ranftl, *Ludwig Tiecks Genoveva als romantische Dichtung betrachtet*, Graz, 1899, 258 pp.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Immermann. *A Study in German Romanticism*, by the writer, pp. 36-42.

parison of Immermann with Gottfried is a contribution to the knowledge of both, while his study of Immermann's style leaves no doubt as to where Immermann's strength did not lie.<sup>84</sup>

Miss Bacon's study, like Goethe's *Faust*, consists of an introduction and two parts. The introduction (pp. 5-14) contrasts the lives of the two poets up to May, 1822, when Immermann reviewed Heine's poems in the "Rheinisch-Westfälischer-Anzeiger." The first part (pp. 15-41) discusses their personal and literary relations, while the second part (pp. 42-96) gives a "psychological explanation of their relationship." There follows (pp. 97-98) a bibliography of thirty-six familiar and easily accessible works. Now, the study of a friendship or hatred that exists between any two artists or poets is as interesting as it is difficult. The individual who writes a book showing just why M'chael Angelo hated Raphael, or why Wagner disliked Brahms, or why Nietzsche detested Wagner, or why it took thirty-five years for Goethe and Schiller to approach and appreciate each other, produces a valuable human document. And the corraling of the scattered data bearing on the apparent life-long friendship between Heine and Immermann was eminently worth while. But Miss Bacon has not quite determined all the figures of her subtracting and minusing, so that her remainder is not quite irrefutable. After setting forth the personal relation of the two men, which could be done briefly,<sup>85</sup> there should have followed a detailed study of the aesthetic, social, religious, political and literary views of the two "Waffenbrüder" as set forth, not simply in their personal letters, but in their impersonal literary creations. For some things the letters of poets are invaluable. But, after all, in letters poets

talk, in their literary creations they act, after poet's fashion. And it is actions, not words, that we need here, especially since Heine is proverbially insincere in many of his assertions, while Immermann is proverbially sincere.

But so far as Miss Bacon has gone, she has fared well. Her contrast of the lives of the two poets is done with a conscientiousness that is its own reward. Her statement (p. 24) that Immermann thought of entering the diplomatic service out of a desire to give Countess Ahlefeldt, "whom he hoped eventually to marry, something worthy of her title," is about the most reasonable remark that has been made in this connection. Her attempt<sup>86</sup> to point out the mutual literary influence (pp. 36-38) of the two poets is a fair beginning, but only a beginning. Her faith in Heine is refreshing if not trustworthy. And the way she proves that the two were always friendly is reasonable, though the word "psychological" should have been deleted from the proof: Immermann's apparently healthy constitution, his passive nature, his ethnic and religious broad-mindedness, his belief in Germany as it should be, his disbelief in Germany as it was, his ability to turn out drama after drama, his inability to write lyrics and his willingness to accept metrical advice from Heine, who was active and sick, chafing under Jewish oppression, longing for dramatic distinction, lacking all dramatic gifts, pining for some one who would take the trouble to study him and call the attention of the world to him, and believing that he had found such a man and such a friend in Immermann,—this is the group of circumstances that lead Miss Bacon to refute Max Koch and others, who believe that Heine never was Immermann's staunch and true friend. But Miss Bacon has made a strong case, as strong as could be made with the material she used. Mechanically, however, her book is about as poor a piece of printing as we have ever seen. Jean Paul's Quintus

<sup>84</sup> Szymanzig's lists of un-German passages (pp. 215-217) and of impossible metrical combinations (p. 232) are mortally convincing.

<sup>85</sup> They never met but once (April, 1824), and Hans Daffis has given us in compact form the fifteen letters of Heine to Immermann. This personal relation can never be studied adequately, since we have but two of the letters Immermann wrote to Heine, the others having been burned in the Hamburg fire of 1833. Cf. Hans Daffis, *Heine-Briefe*, 2 Bände, Berlin, 1907.

<sup>86</sup> Miss Bacon accepts Richard M. Meyer as an authority on the weighing of literary influences. One of the wisest suggestions, however, on this point is found in Hans Rühl: *Die ältere Romantik und die Kunst des jungen Goethe*, Berlin, 1909, pp. 71-72.

Fixlein,<sup>37</sup> who was anxious to collect all the mistakes in the printing of all German literature, would have revelled in this work. After spending so much time on a good subject, Miss Bacon owed it to herself and her readers to see to it that the study was well published. In the ninety-eight pages, there are thirty-five exasperating typographical errors.<sup>38</sup>

In view of the five works that form the subject of the present article, and twenty-one others that have appeared since 1896, it is evident that Immermann is being studied more now than then. For, although he published on many different occasions, he received but nine reviews in the *Jenaer Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, which covered the ground rather thoroughly from 1785 to 1848; and of these nine discussions, only three really hit the mark. Taking them up seriatim, the reviewer suggests that Immermann did not mention the source (Gryphius) of *Cardenio* because he was ashamed of it. He believes that Immermann noted down, while at Halle, all the student slang that we have in the drama, so that he could later make mercantile use of it. And he says that, after all, these students are not well drawn, for, despite their dissipation, they study Shakespeare.<sup>39</sup> *Hofer* is condemned utterly: it lacks the beautiful language of *Petrarca*, the characterizations of *Edwin* and the Romance passion of *Ronceval*.<sup>40</sup> *Die Schule der Frommen* is highly praised as an attack, by an able poet, on hypocritical pietism.<sup>41</sup> The *Gedichte* (1830) are well appraised. Significantly enough, the reviewer singles out those for discussion which Maync edited.<sup>42</sup> The recension of *Pygmalion*, *Carneval* and *Die schelmische Gräfin* is lazily done. The critic gives, for example, the plot of the first, which is extremely simple, but says he must omit the plot of the second; this is extremely complicated, and in it lies incidentally

the whole point of the novelette.<sup>43</sup> The reviewer of *Tulifüntchen* gives the plot and asks for better, smoother verse.<sup>44</sup> *Merlin* is outlined at great length; then the reviewer asks whether the idea was clear to the poet himself. He assures us that without Goethe's *Faust* there would have been no *Merlin*.<sup>45</sup> The criticism of *Alexis* is long and valuable, discussing as it does the relation of the dramatist to history.<sup>46</sup> The account of the *Reisejournal* is good; it points out the marked difference between subjective and objective travel descriptions.<sup>47</sup> The reviewer also picked up two mistakes on the part of Immermann which escaped Boxberger.<sup>48</sup>

Aside from Immermann's services as a regisseur at Düsseldorf (1832-1837), which compel students of the stage to discuss him when they discuss Lessing, Goethe, Tieck, Laube and Wagner, and aside from the poetic spots in his many works, Immermann's services as a theme-suggester are indisputable. *Münchhausen*, to mention only one case in conclusion, contains the six main motives of Poe's *Fall of the House of Usher*. But his weaknesses are also great. Lacking that lyric gift indispensable to the dramatist in verse and of great help to the epic writer in prose, he neither knew when to begin nor when to stop. Machiavelli put on his best clothes when he sat down to write; C. F. Meyer said he felt as though he had crossed the threshold of a temple when he began to compose; and Fouqué never started a composition without first offering up a prayer. Immermann wrote when he could find the time; and we have no evidence that he bathed or prayed before starting. Furthermore, he wrote too long without resting. A number of times he tells us that he wrote until completely exhausted. This un-

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Quintus Fixlein*, Zweiter Zettelkasten.

<sup>38</sup> On pp. 6 (2), 7, 11, 12, 13 (2), 14, 18, 19, 28, 29, 31 (2), 32, 35 (2), 36, 37, 38, 39, 46, 48, 63, 77, 82, 92, 97 (3), 98 (5).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. No. 169, July, 1826.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. No. 76, March, 1828.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. No. 154, August, 1830.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. No. 149, August, 1831.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. No. 100, May, 1831.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. No. 42, March, 1832.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Nos. 121 and 122, *Ergänzungsblatt*, Dec., 1833.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. No. 166, Sept., 1834.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. No. 171, Sept., 1834.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Hempel, Bd. x, pp. 98-99. Immermann mistook Gustav Pfizer for his brother Paul. The latter wrote the *Briefwechsel zweier Deutschen*. And Immermann tells the South Germans to read Thucydides and while reading him to keep their mind on Philip of Macedonia—who lived nearly a century later than Thucydides.



doubtedly accounts for the irregularity of his works. There are passages in *Tristan* (Die Jagd, Der Mittagszauber) that are superb; others are wretched. Had he kept as detailed a diary as did Platen, we would very likely find that on some days during the composition of *Tristan* he was very tired; on others he felt extremely strong. And this is the group of circumstances that make Immermann attract the specialist rather than please the general reader.

ALLEN WILSON PORTERFIELD.

Barnard College.

## THE SPEAR OF LONGINUS

*The Legend of Longinus in Ecclesiastical Tradition and in English Literature, and its Connection with the Grail*, by ROSE J. PEEBLES. Bryn Mawr, 1911. vi + 221 pp. (*Bryn Mawr College Monographs*, Vol. IX.)

Chapter VI, "Longinus in English Literature," is the best part of this thesis. In this chapter (pp. 80-141), Miss Peebles has worked in a field with which she is familiar, her compilation is thoughtfully made, and her authorities are carefully examined. It is a pity that the good impression created by this part of her work should be spoiled by numerous other chapters, "Longinus in Art," "The Lance as a Relic," "Longinus and the Grail," etc., which attempt to cover too much ground, and as a result contain comparatively uncritical and sometimes misleading material.

One need not be an expert on Christian antiquities to see the inadequacy of a compilation on "The Lance as a Relic" (Chap. IV, pp. 56 f) which makes no mention of the most useful book on the subject (F. de Mély, *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, Vol. III, Paris, 1904).<sup>1</sup> De Mély would have set Miss Peebles

right about the present location of the relics which claim to be the lance of Longinus, and even have supplied her with pictures of these objects.<sup>2</sup> De Mély (p. 32) might have warned her that the date of the *Breviarius de Hierosolyma* is in dispute. It is plainly later than Arculf (670c), and the particular phrase of

Peebles has printed at length the Latin Mass of Pseudo-Chrysostom. On the next page she has, also in full, a literal translation of it into English, without any suggestion that it is the same thing, but with the words: "Another striking testimony is given in this translation from Old-Slavonic."

It is necessary to mention this careless workmanship because it doubtless excuses certain places in the thesis where Miss Peebles gives vague dates to citations which describe the marvelous qualities of the lance of Longinus, and then suggests that these qualities may be the source of those of the Grail lance.

For example, on page 186 Miss Peebles prints a number of mediaeval references to the bleeding lance of Longinus, labeling them "the beginning of the twelfth century," "the twelfth century," etc., implying that these might have influenced Chrétien's *Perceval*, 1175c. As authority for these vague dates she gives Grober's [*sic*, twice!] *Grundriss*. But Gröber gives more exact dates: "1180c," "end of twelfth century," etc., which Miss Peebles has altered. Her implication would not otherwise be possible. She should have told us [doubtless she did not notice] that *La Chanson d'Antioche* [which she labels "beginning of the twelfth century"] exists only in a remaking by Graindor de Douai, 1180c. Her citation from this Chanson, and all other citations which she labels "twelfth century" are probably later than Chrétien and influenced by him.

Again, on page 61, her chapter on "The Lance as a Relic" is summed up thus: "The lance, then, was in the middle ages [before or after Chrétien?] . . . an object of veneration and reverence. It shone by night as the sun shines by day. [This is based on the sentence in the *Breviarius de Hierosolyma*]. It blazed when proof of its authenticity was needed." [This depends on *Le Chevalier au Cygne*. I find no such passage, but it matters little whether it exists or not, since the date of *Le Chevalier au Cygne* is after 1250. *Verbum sat*!]

<sup>2</sup> Miss Peebles says (p. 61): "One (lance) is preserved at Prague, and another at Norimbiga." She has evidently failed to observe that "Norimbiga" is "Italian" for Nuremberg. She is referring to a single relic, which appears to have been at Prague till 1424, at Nuremberg till 1800, and is now at Vienna. (See de Mély, III, 64.

<sup>1</sup> Miss Peebles' work has had insufficient supervision. "Itinera Hierosolyma" (p. 57, note 2) is strange Latin, and misprints abound in the Latin quotations (Cf. pp. 21, 73, 77). On pages 64-5 Miss